

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/742,895 | SUZUKI, KENZABURO | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Arnel C. Lavarias | 2872 | |

All Participants:
Status of Application: Allowance

 (1) Arnel C. Lavarias.

(3) _____.

 (2) Mitchell W. Shapiro (Applicant's representative).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 5 December 2005
Time: 11:00 PM
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

 If Yes, provide a brief description: *n/a*.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

n/a

Claims discussed:

4-5,9-10,27

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a
Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



Arnel C. Lavarias

Patent Examiner

Group Art Unit 2872

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted Applicant's representative to request authorization for an examiner's amendment to correct minor informalities in Claims 4-5, 9-10, and 27. In particular, Claims 4 and 9 are objected to not further limiting the base independent claim upon which they depend on (i.e. the limitations in Claims 4 and 9 are both already recited in base independent Claim 17). It was suggested that Claims 4 and 9 be cancelled, Claim 5 amended to depend on Claim 3, and Claim 10 amended to depend on Claim 8. In addition, Claim 27 is objected to since the term 'phiR' has not been defined in the claim. It was suggest that 'phiR denotes the effective diameter of the most image side lens surface of the second lens group' be inserted at the end of Claim 27 to correct this informality. The Applicant's representative authorized these changes. Details of the examiner's amendments may be found in the attached Office Action.